

Remarks/Arguments

In the Advisory Action dated June 21, 2010, the Examiner states that claim 1 recites "comprising." Applicants are not sure of the relevance of this statement. The Examiner also states that the combination of Ehrlich and Humphrey discloses "hollowed along a portion of its length" because the gullet is considered partially hollowed when the needle of Ehrlich as modified by Humphrey is made from a solid needle. Applicants disagree, as there is no teaching in either of Ehrlich or Humphrey to combine hollow and solid. Ehrlich only discloses hollow needles and Humphrey discloses either solid or hollow. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would combine the tips of Ehrlich with a hollow needle of Humphrey. There is no motivation for any other combination. Accordingly, the combination does not meet the claim limitation of a lancet including a seamless member hollowed along a portion of its length.


In the Advisory Action the Examiner states "one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the depth of penetration should be about the same with the length of lancet point because it has been proven to be the effective depth of penetration." This is Applicants' argument exactly. This is why the combination clearly fails to meet the claim limitation, which requires the penetration distance to be *less than* a length of the sharpened tips.

Accordingly, the Examiner is asked to reconsider the allowability of the claims. Applicants also request the supplemental response to entered for purposes of appeal.

In the event that the Examiner deems a telephonic discussion would be helpful in advancing the prosecution of the present application, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at (248) 244-0163.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG BASILE
HANLON & MACFARLANE PC



Dated: June 30, 2010

By: Francine B. Nesti, Reg. No. 53376
Attorneys for Applicant